



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the *secrétaire d'état* took a stand opposed to the majority of his colleagues, and counselled, whenever it was possible with honor, a policy of peace with Spain. The causes which led Villeroy to adopt this attitude—from his first apprenticeship under Charles IX., through the period of his enforced retirement and disgrace (1588–1594) owing to his close identification with Mayenne and the League—to the time when, in the regency of Marie de Médicis, he was able, temporarily at least, to carry his ideas into practice—are recounted at length; a sane and moderate statement of the many justifications of this policy follows; indeed the kernel of the book is to be found here. Doubtless a number of M. Nouailiac's points will be challenged, especially his estimate of the value of the great peace of 1612–1613, which was largely his hero's doing. But it should be remembered that the situation in Villeroy's day was by no means as clear as it later became. Because Richelieu staked all on an anti-Spanish policy and won, posterity has been prone to fall into the grave error of thinking that this was the sole possible line to take in 1610. That this was far from being the case M. Nouailiac's book plainly shows, and adds thereby one more to a long and imposing list of warnings that the problems of the past were by no means as simple as some glib writers, who forget that they have the advantage of a perspective of centuries, would make their readers think.

Did space permit, we should gladly dwell at greater length on this able and scholarly volume. It merits a high place among the works of Mariéjol, Bourrilly, Hauser, Courteault, and others who have recently done so much to illuminate the history of sixteenth-century France. If we ventured on any criticism it would be to remark that the relations of France and England are somewhat less completely worked out than the rest of the diplomacy of the time; and the omission of any mention of the Elizabethan calendars, especially the Spanish and Foreign (though the latter only goes to 1582) from the list of "Sources Anglaises" on page xx is certainly a matter of surprise. This comparative scantiness on the English side is however a defect almost inevitably inherent in the biography of a sixteenth-century Frenchman who has been called a "père de la paix d'Espagne", and as the tendency hitherto has been decidedly to neglect the Spanish side of the period in favor of the English, M. Nouailiac's omissions should not be remembered against him.

ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN.

*An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts: a Chapter in the Evolution of Religious and Civil Liberty in England.* By WILLIAM PIERCE. (London: Archibald Constable and Company. 1908. Pp. xix, 350.)

REV. WILLIAM PIERCE, a graduate of Brecon College in Wales, and now pastor of the Doddridge Church in Northampton, England, has long been a student of the beginnings of Nonconformity, though the volume before us is his first extensive publication on the theme. The work,

though written from the point of view of strong sympathy with the Puritan movement, is a worthy tribute to his patience in investigation and scholarly ability. No discussion of the Marprelate Tracts which has yet appeared so fully puts the reader in a position to understand the circumstances of their production, the immediate controversies out of which they grew, or so carefully analyzes the vexed question of the authorship of these first considerable attempts at the use of satire in English. The introduction and first two chapters, some one hundred and thirty-four pages, are devoted to a review of the English ecclesiastical situation from the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, and especially to the first years of the primacy of Archbishop Whitgift—a review designed to show the policy of the queen and her chief prelate, and the aims of those opposed to it.

Coming to the tracts themselves, Mr. Pierce is able to make evident that the immediate antecedents of the controversy are to be found in a small anonymous tract of 1584, probably by William Fulke, master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, entitled *A Briefe and Plaine Declaration*, etc.; and bearing the running caption, *A Learned Discourse of Ecclesiasticall Government*, which has been "confused by all modern writers who have touched upon the matter with Walter Travers's *Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae*. . . . *Explicatio*, the English translation of which bore the title *A Full and Plaine Declaration*". It was in reply to this *Learned Discourse* and not to the work of Travers that John Bridges, dean of Sarum, wrote his bulky *Defence of the Government Established in the Church of Englande for Ecclesiasticall Matters*, of 1587, which, in turn, called out the first of the Marprelate Tracts in 1588.

Mr. Pierce discusses the printing of the tracts, in the light of evidence obtained by subsequent legal examination, with great thoroughness. In his judgment they "are a protest against oppression; a cry for more liberty; first, for religious liberty, and then by necessity for civil liberty. . . . It will be clearly seen with what little ground the Marprelate Tracts have been denounced as seditious, heretical, blasphemous, and scurrilous."

Regarding their authorship Mr. Pierce presents the evidence with great thoroughness and with candid suspense of judgment. The ascription of them to Henry Barrowe made by Henry Martyn Dexter, he shows, as Powicke had already demonstrated in his *Henry Barrow* (1900), to be untenable on theological grounds. Undoubtedly John Penry and Job Throckmorton were deeply in the undertaking, but Mr. Pierce is unable to ascribe the authorship to them with the complete confidence manifested by Arber in his *English Scholar's Library* (1880). "In regard to the housing of the press, the provision of printers and distributors, there is no doubt that Penry is the principal figure"; but considerations of style make it impossible that he could have been the author of the most characteristic portions of the tracts. Circumstances point strongly to Job Throckmorton, whom Wilson in the *Cambridge*

*History of English Literature* (1909) regards as the not proved but scarcely to be questioned "principal agent". Mr. Pierce is disposed, however, to give some weight to Throckmorton's affirmation, "I am not Martin. I knewe not Martin." Much points to him; but Mr. Pierce cautiously concludes:

All that we are compelled to say in a spirit of unprejudiced fairness is, that the identification of Job Throckmorton as Marprelate is not complete; and nothing that we have been able to adduce positively shuts out the existence of a Great Unknown, or makes it quite incredible that the assumptions of "Martin Junior" and "Martin Senior" and the solemn denial of Throckmorton, are in agreement with historic fact. We await the lucky discovery of the next student of these interesting documents to set our perplexities at rest.

It may be hoped that Mr. Pierce will soon publish the annotated edition of the text of the Marprelate Tracts which he has had for some time in preparation.

WILLISTON WALKER.

*The Wars of Religion in France, 1559-1576: the Huguenots, Catherine de Medici, and Philip II.* By JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON, Ph.D., Associate Professor of European History in the University of Chicago. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1909. Pp. xv, 635.)

THE eighteen chapters of this important work have been skilfully distributed by the writer into five parts, each part, except the first, of 100 pages. The first 130 pages sketch the condition of France from the death of Henry II. to the outbreak of the first civil war. The second describes the first civil war, the resultant brief war with England, and concludes with an excellent chapter on Early Local and Provincial Catholic Leagues; one of the most original and important parts of the book. One hundred pages are given to the royal tour of the provinces and the Conference of Bayonne, in which the author deftly makes evident the internal situation of France and her external relations. The fourth section consists of an account of the second and third civil wars. The final section of the book opens with a chapter on the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the last two chapters sketch the formation of the *politique* faction, its relation to the crown and to the Huguenots until the Peace of Monsieur in 1576.

In a modest preface the author gives his "reasons for venturing to write a new book on an old subject". His book is his best excuse and he needs no other. Mr. Thompson's book is not only newer but also broader than Baird's excellent work on the *Rise of the Huguenots*, where the author limited his field by his title. And most important of all, in describing that bitter turmoil of interests and ideals Mr. Thompson is scrupulously impartial. Not that the able and scholarly Professor Baird ever showed the smallest indifference to evidence, but that his strong bias in favor of the Huguenots, naïvely shown by his use of adjectives, sometimes led him unconsciously to select for narration such